LB 2325
.A5
Copy 1

The Changing and the Permanent

IN

LIBERAL EDUCATION.

NEWTON LLOYD ANDREWS.

The Changing and the Permanent

IN

Liberal Education.

An Address

Delivered at Hamilton, N. Y., June 15th, 1904, before the Alumni Association of Colgate University, and reprinted from their Report.

LB2325
.A5

Gift
Author
(Person)
20Ja '08

The Changing and the Permanent in Liberal Education.

AMONG the many movements affecting the higher interests of society during recent decades none has been more conspicuous than that which has modified collegiate education. Marked tendencies toward change have made headway, and concession has been more common than opposition.

Have we then a "new education?" Have traditional methods and aims been superseded? Do the changes touch what is vital, or are the best values conserved? Is a reaction to be desired, or shall the present trend go on? These are questions to which an intelligent answer can be given, only as we search for elements fixed and variable, and so discover the changing and the permanent in liberal education.

It is not a question of new subjects or new methods of advanced instruction, for education and instruction are not identical. Higher instruction may be quite different from liberal education. Moreover, the term "liberal" does not necessarily mean "bountiful." Plentifulness of subjects does not guarantee liberal training. Higher education, in order to be liberal, must have a distinctive scope, aim, and spirit. Its extent does not make it so, but rather its content and intent. Knowledge sought and used only as equipment for an occupation, a trade, a profession, may be marvelously minute and extensive, but it is not liberal.

We must distinguish, as Plato did, those studies which are pursued "not with the view of making any of them a profession, but only as a part of education, and because a private gentleman and a freeman ought to know them." So the "liberal arts" of the mediæval time were those deemed necessary to freemen, and deficient though they were in range, had high value in developing human capacity.

A similar conception determined the type of education which has been known as "collegiate." To give a training "which

enlarges and disciplines the mind, and makes it master of its own powers, irrespective of the particular business or profession one may follow" has been the recognized province of the college.

Now the studies of a technical or a professional school have predominantly a different purpose. The multiplication of such schools, and the establishment in Universities properly so-called of professional and technical courses for graduate students, has been a natural and legitimate advance. Let there be no contemptuous estimate of such courses as "Brodstudien," but let it be clearly recognized that their purpose is not primarily cultural. The instruction given may be more advanced than that of the college, but in so far as it is specialized, it is not liberalizing. No study can be such by itself. The united influence of several informing and disciplinary branches of knowledge addressing and developing diverse powers is necessary to liberal education. For this work of general training the colleges have long stood, and in so far as any of them have abandoned this position by the encouragement of undue specialization, they have taken the risk of promoting a kind of education no longer broad and liberal.

Not he in whom some one capacity is trained, but the mind that is in some good measure master of its varied powers, and can bring to bear its whole self in effective effort is really educated. The enlargement is not chiefly in knowledge, as the increased dimensions of a storehouse may accommodate larger contents. It is a result of exercised faculties, a matter of organic growth. Pabulum is requisite for this living process, and that food must be knowledge, but it nourishes only through assimilation. Not always, perhaps never, does knowledge once for all exhaust its ministry. Retained and reproduced, it renews its service, perennially re-enforcing the intellectual life. Moreover, we may not doubt that much, once appropriated but now escaping recognition, has only sifted down to those depths of our nature where personality is nurtured, the very source of thought, feeling, action. Certainly such a conception of education cannot be permanently obscured.

A view entirely in harmony with this is sometimes expressed in a familiar scientific phrase. We are told that education should adjust us to our environment. As man belongs to the physical

world, he needs some knowledge of its laws and forces, and of his own organism as subject thereto. As a member of society, he must deal in thought and speech with his fellows, and so requires training in language. Furthermore, he must know something of the ideas and sentiments in which human life has expressed itself, and which in turn have reacted upon life. He cannot then forego literature. It will help him interpret the tone and temper of his time. The culture which comes, as Matthew Arnold says, from knowing the best that has been thought and said, is no mere matter of inward satisfaction. It affords needful orientation in contemporary life. Education must "enable a man to know himself and the world."

There must be adjustment to the body politic, that citizenship may be intelligent and noble. Government can be worthily understood only through history. And who can adjust himself to his fellows either politically or socially, unless he knows himself? This self-discovery on the intellectual and moral side will be quite inadequate without psychology and ethics. Nay, as respects both these departments of his nature, unless one is still to "grope about in worlds unrealized," philosophy and religion must afford their infinite outlook.

If "adjustment to environment" means all this, such education will have breadth, and balance, and proportion. Its processes will result in that discipline and command of varied faculties which is traditionally associated with "liberal education." The new phrase describes only another aspect of the one reality.

But, it is urged that, as the educated man must find his place in the activities of the world, he should be so instructed and trained as first to find himself, in other words, to discover his aptitudes. As an educational principle, however, this must be subordinate to the higher aim of general development. How indeed can adaptation be properly proved except through acquaintance with a variety of studies which shall adequately test manifold capacities? Certainly, special aptitudes should not be hastily pre-supposed, and they are rarely hard and fast limitations. "A man who is good for anything," said one of our humorists, "is good for something else." To become oneself, in some good degree of roundness, is in the best sense to find oneself, and this should take precedence of finding one's place. When, moreover,

that place is found, he is worth most to himself and to society, who by his breadth of general attainments has largest inward resources, and widest sympathy with the training and pursuits of others.

In the light of these definitions, let us consider certain current changes in collegiate education. Among them, what is more obvious than the greater diversity in those who offer themselves for educational shaping? In earlier days the college was primarily for those intending the learned professions. The minister, the lawyer, the physician, and the teacher, required, by general consent, liberal training, and "liberal" meant "balanced," "symmetrical." If other young men, from well-to-do families, went to college, a sufficient reason was seen in the intrinsic value of general culture. Recent decades have shown a large increase in those looking forward to mercantile and manufacturing pursuits. Others come without definite purpose, moved chiefly by a vague thought of the advantage of a baccalaureate degree, or attracted by the widely reported charms of college life. Again, competition among colleges, due in part to the feeling that size marks success, has made it easier, by the aid of scholarships, to obtain a college course. The result is that our student communities represent widely varying interests, and some of these interests are but scantily educational. Indeed, prominent educators have specially emphasized the claims of great institutions as affording to young men opportunities for the largest acquaintance with those who are to share with them the leadership of their generation—an acquaintance likely to be commercially and socially advantageous. What wonder then, if students in other ways subordinate the essential to the incidental?

The changed constituency of the colleges has had great influence upon courses and methods of study. The Faculties and Trustees have come to vie with one another in concessions to supposed popular demands. This has brought the danger of being untrue to the ideals of liberal education. Had there been among some half as much eagerness to show young men and their parents what liberal training is, and what it is worth, as there was haste in making innovations, more would have been conserved of what experience had found worthy to be permanent elements in our educational processes.

Besides, may it not fairly be questioned whether our colleges are not likely to be too generally and indiscriminately attractive? Should every young man who wishes vaguely, and for no intelligent and adequate reason, to enter college, be encouraged to do so? Is any limitation desirable? Ought any line to be drawn? Certainly not any line drawn by considerations of wealth, birth, or purpose in study. But may we not properly desire as prerequisites the possession of some fair measure of intellectual capacity, and a settled disposition to intellectual effort? Time was when gifted young men were considered to be especially marked out for collegiate advantages. Is the pursuit of advanced studies for the real interest of those whom nature has not endowed with suitable gifts? I venture to think that if college authorities err in retaining such students, a graver responsibility often rests on teachers in secondary schools who have been ready to send to college pupils of slender abilities. He who has himself received a liberal training should have insight to discover intellectual gifts, for the young are sometimes only half conscious of them, and should encourage the capable to develop them most broadly. But why send to college those whose capacity and disposition to study are alike mediocre?

Samuel J. Tilden once said "some men's minds are like the soil of the Adirondacks, naturally thin, and soon exhausted by cultivation." Yet many such minds, assiduously applied to the practical pursuits of life, and educated by their occupation and their experience, have little occasion to regret the lack of collegiate advantages. Will it be said that if some seek the colleges who do not adequately profit by them, yet "the fittest will survive?" Yes—but why not save from waste and loss and disappointment those whose struggle for existence seems foredoomed to failure?

Conspicuous among changes in collegiate education during recent decades are many new subjects of study, and some new methods of teaching. The older alumni of most American colleges find in the present curricula an array of subjects fairly startling. The earlier, aggressive invaders of the old order were the sciences of nature. In the olden time two prescribed terms of "natural philosophy," one of which dealt with mechanics, and the other with physics, another term of astronomy, and one or two of chemistry and geology, made up the ordinary provision

for the study of science. Now chemistry and geology offer elective courses running through three or four years, while physics and biology extend over periods hardly shorter.

The modern languages are open to students in many successive terms. English literature presents not a few attractive vistas, and courses in history are hardly less numerous. Psychology and philosophy have larger place, and mathematics a wider range. The ancient languages do not lack courses, even if they lack students. Political economy, sociology, the history of art, and not a few other subjects, are also included in the bill of fare. Much the greater part are elective. To partake of all is impossible. The "table d'hôte" has given way to service "à la carte."

After the Freshman year, there is little attempt as of old to secure a balanced course of study. Symmetry in training may be conceded to be good, but few are urged to seek it. Colgate, it is true, by an arrangement of groups in the Sophomore year, implies a judgment that the entering Sophomore is not yet prepared for an unrestricted range. The general tendency of the time is to make little restriction. The several departments offer as many courses as the individual professor is able to carry, and if there are assistants in any department, the number of courses is proportionally increased. As professors and instructors are but human, it is only natural so to emphasize their respective subjects that students will hardly be reminded of the value and importance of other work. Indeed, a student may hastily assume that some particular subject meets his special needs, and is adapted to his purpose in life, or in harmony with his ideal of education, when as yet he knows too little of other subjects to warrant an intelligent judgment.

No wonder that young men are bewildered by the multitude of elective courses, and are prompted to exclaim: "There are so many things we should like, we do not know what to take!" Some of us who had our training in the days of prescribed courses may not altogether regret that our subjects of study were chosen, and the time allotted to each was determined, by those who were presumed to be more competent than we to decide what should be studied and how long, and who sought to devise a curriculum wisely balanced in the interests of general culture. Must the introduction of other subjects cause the abandonment of all effort

to secure symmetry? Shall different elective courses be deemed competitive, so that teachers shall be concerned only about the attendance upon their own classes? Rather let each cherish a generous interest in the courses of his colleagues, not simply as a matter of inter-departmental courtesy, but as himself recognizing the value to every student of the broadest possible range of study. Let each be unselfishly glad also when any who have not satisfactorily responded to his own special discipline, become elsewhere intellectually alert through wakening aptitudes for other work.

The old-time curriculum embodied the judgment and the experience of educated men concerning the nature and the extent of those studies which belonged to liberal training. Among all the changes that have come, is not the guidance of experience a permanent need? Must we give up the thought of directing the studies of young men? For one, I believe that if collegiate education is to remain truly liberal, the principle of guidance must in some form be an abiding element in our plans. It has indeed been proposed that every college student should have among his professors an assigned adviser. To what extent such an idea has been realized I do not know, but the importance of the arrangement is clear.

Obviously, the adviser should be a man of all possible symmetry and breadth of culture, and of an impartiality so absolute that he could advise, if necessary, against the taking of his own courses. To a man of the right quality such a relation would offer a most enviable opportunity for usefulness. Mere administrative capacity is not comparable to this sort of service. Any teacher might welcome such access to the very springs of the student's intellectual life. If our colleges are still to stand for liberal training, they must in some such way seek to protect their students from pursuing at random narrow, ill-balanced courses.

Collegiate methods of instruction have experienced change. Laboratory work is a comparatively new feature, and its value is obvious. Every student should know something of the scientific processes. Such work, however, deserves concentrated attention, and ought never to be degraded by listless dawdling; nor ought it to be pursued through many courses without the balancing influence of studies in language, literature, and philosophy. Other-

wise, it is a technical discipline, not a constituent of general culture.

The lecture-method has come into large use, and not always with the happiest results. It has become especially common since college professors have been chiefly chosen from those who have pursued University courses. Such men have been prone to use with college students methods similar to those which gave direction to their own graduate studies. They have not been careful to ascertain whether their pupils are prepared for them. That lectures are often very welcome to students may only signify that to take notes and to be quizzed upon them requires less severe work than to master a text-book. My own judgment is that text-books are best for the handling of most college subjects. Not unseldom the lecture-method flatters both instructor and pupil at the expense of both. Certainly, if the teacher's modesty will permit him to regard another's presentation of any subject as fairly equal to what he might himself give, there is ample opportunity in the discussions of the class-room to elucidate, to criticise, and to supplement, and so to cultivate in the mind of the student that general attitude towards all books which will prepare him to be a careful, thoughtful, independent reader.

Above all, lecture-methods are unfortunate, if used to such an extent as to diminish unduly the training of the student in the power and habit of reproduction. The capacity to grasp and restate the thought of others can hardly be overvalued. It tends to mutual understanding in society and in business. Without it the largest reading yields but vague and confused impressions. And who does not need it that listens to public address? For one who is himself to speak or to write it should be deemed indispensable. To apprehend clearly the statements of a text-book, to seize and hold the logical relations of the author's thought, and to present consecutively and effectively a train of reasoning or course of exposition, is an intellectual gymnastic. But it is not discipline for discipline's sake. It is directly helpful to the vigorous development of one's own thinking, and to the clear communication of thought. Mere memoriter work may be mechanical and deadening, but a right reproduction is vitalizing. Æschylus says, that memory is "mother of the muses." Its proper training should have permanent place in our education.

In examining further the changes which appear in our colleges, it is proper to consider whether the student's own attitude is altered. Every educated man, even the liberally educated man, is essentially self-educated. How then shall he lack that energizing spirit which the very word "student" implies? Must he not be moved by a genuine "studium?" And that is fondness, zeal, endeavor, application, exertion, assiduity! Is not, however, the "studium" of average college life unduly diverted, and in some measure misdirected? The scholarly spirit has certainly lost somewhat of prestige. To every entering student comes the obtrusive voice, "It is proper that you should know games; for a man has no greater glory, so long as he lives, than that which he accomplishes with his hands or his feet." So much of Homer is made almost compulsory by the most pronounced non-Hellenists. In matters athletic there is absorbing interest. O for a steadier glow of eagerness in things scholarly and intellectual!

Again, is there a still abiding desire of knowledge for the very sake of knowledge? Yes—but in far too many the commercial, materialistic time-spirit has fostered the feeling that only the so-called "practical" is worth the knowing, and study is too largely prompted by utilitarian considerations. Even on this plane, however, it is quite impossible to say of any acquisition that it may not in some unforeseen way prove of value. Let us insist, of course, that knowledge which develops thought, ministers to life, and prompts to service, is highest of all, but to the man of liberal education knowledge itself is an unfailing source of intellectual satisfaction.

Perhaps the principle of election in studies may be deemed a frank confession that we can no longer hold up as a potent ideal the pursuit of knowledge for its own sake, but that adaptation and interest must wholly decide the student's work. But the elective principle may not wisely be so radically applied as prematurely to assume adaptations of a limited, exclusive sort; nor must interest as a pedagogic principle hold undivided sway. Naturally, every college teacher appreciates the elective system for the relief that is found in securing willing students for advanced courses. The reluctant have no longer to be dragged to water which they will not drink. But even here perhaps consideration for the instructor's comfort ought not always to out-

weigh the student's need. The interest of some in certain studies seems not unmixed with a more or less vague sense that those subjects mark the line of least resistance. The presupposition of tastes and aptitudes for mathematical and scientific work in young men prepared on that side for admission to college is not always justified by their college record, for both adaptation and interest prove sometimes deficient; and instructors in the ancient classics cannot always be sure that others would have been so much interested in the old paths, if those paths could be traveled only by pedestrians, unaided by the equine race.

For truly liberal education there are other tests of value than interest. One of them, let it be boldly said, is difficulty. Some studies are good, because they are hard. It is said there were too many hard places in our older fixed courses, but it is now quite too possible to leave hard things out. Who can doubt what would be the testimony of men twenty years out of college? Some of them remember the thrill of satisfaction which came with the solution, after patient effort, of a difficult mathematical problem, or with the discovery, clear and full, of the meaning of a puzzling Greek or Latin passage. Such experiences are formative. As in the moral life and the practical life, so in the intellectual life, the highest success comes through the mastery of obstacles. The acceptance of what is hard, the facing and conquering of difficulties is tonic. Liberal education ought to set a man free from his moods, so that he can bring himself to his duty, whether it be or be not interesting, and grapple with it promptly and resolutely in spite of all listlessness and of any counter attractions. Providence has not ordered life wholly on the elective plan. Perplexities and difficulties are largely prescribed. The man whose studies have been chosen only for their interest is ill-prepared for the world.

Professor Ladd says: "The studies in my college curriculum were wholly prescribed; they included the ancient classics in Junior year, and calculus, both integral and differential. I was especially fond of Greek and philosophy, but I studied calculus with more carefulness on that very account. I learned to do patiently the things set me to do, to work hard and wait for the reward, to conquer every task, whatever it might be, before leaving it. And I would not give this bit of learning for all that is to be got from the most attractive elective courses of Harvard and

Yale." A host of witnesses would bear like testimony. Let us welcome the interest which means inclination, but let us help young men to see and seek their interest in that other, quite as important meaning—their advantage. The profit of a study may make impertinent the question of liking or disliking.

The drift toward change in modern education sometimes appears in the spirit of haste. Study is superseded by cramming, and education is thought to consist in the passing of examinations. Colleges in turn consent to shorten the period of residence. Instead of frankly insisting that four years are not too long to ensure that growth which a baccalaureate degree should signify, they announce a certain number of term-hours as constituting their requirement for graduation, and even point out to the entering student that the addition of certain extra hours to the term's quota will make it possible to take his degree in a shorter time. Because the fuller and stricter requirements of medical and law schools demand longer professional study, the inference is often drawn that the student's liberal training must be abbreviated. What, however, does the welfare of society demand? Is there any clear call from the public announcing their impatient haste to entrust their property interests to the young lawyer, or the care of their health to the young physician? He who assumes this may discover to his pain that maturity of mind and breadth of training promise even a pecuniary advantage to him who bides his time.

Already in educational circles there is a wholesome reaction against such innovations. Since the proposition to give college students the baccalaureate degree at the end of two years was broached by a college president who is himself so shining an example of liberal culture that one could almost have suspected his suggestion to be an ironical "reductio ad absurdum," the question seems lulled to rest. *Requiescat in pace.* The absurdity was quickly revealed by the illuminating inquiry, "Who that ever had to do with Sophomores could think them fit to be graduated?"

The setting of examinations is not teaching, and the passing of examinations is not education. Knowledge thus acquired is too apt to slip away, and even if retained, is often inorganic material not easily assimilated and transmuted for mental growth. Educative processes demand time. There must be opportunity for reflection, and even for unconscious absorption and infiltration.

It is a misfortune for the student to be altogether engrossed with work even in subjects commanding his interest. Let not acquisition outrun digestion. One may trace the trend of history without being overladen with its multitudinous events. Some of our predecessors whose Latin and Greek lessons were shorter may have known quite as intimately the spirit of antiquity. So too, the characteristic methods of physical science may be rightly understood, and the practical applications of its laws or the philosophic bearings of its theories may be clearly discerned, without encyclopædic acquaintance with scientific phenomena. In short, less knowledge of any sort, gained without hurry, and thoughtfully appropriated, is far more liberalizing than hasty accumulations.

Imperfect and narrow as the older college curriculum was, it did not expose the student to the risk of attempting too much, nor did it invite him to shorten his stay. More might have been exacted, and by many might have been accomplished, but the margin of freedom had value. In those days, when courses in English Literature and in History were meagre or did not exist, students not a few made fruitful use of their leisure in extensive, voluntary reading, not always perhaps most wisely directed, but inspired by a true intellectual enthusiasm, and so ministering richly to their general culture, and the development of an historic judgment and a literary sense. Haste, cram, and pressure could not have developed them, nor would assigned reading have had the same value.

Amidst all that is changing, it must still be a prerequisite for truly liberal education that the teacher shall be a man of broadly cultured mind. He should himself illustrate the worth of such a training. A specialist he must be, but he ought to be more—a liberally educated specialist. No group of narrow men, however proficient each may be in his specialty, should constitute a college Faculty. They might contribute to a varied assortment of knowledge, but the composite result might not be symmetrical growth. A certain breadth of general attainments should be the supporting background for any specialization. In true men this would guarantee breadth of sympathy. Every head of a department should have an appreciative and generous interest in all other departments. The flow of his enthusiasm

for his own subjects should make no current counter to other lines of instruction.

Successful teaching still demands a forceful character. No aggregation of attainments can be a substitute for the ability to awaken and inspire. This is sometimes forgotten. The substance of collegiate instruction is now so often regarded as a bundle of specialties loosely associated that undue emphasis is often laid upon extent of acquirements, rather than upon teaching capacity. A University Faculty may properly enough find place for one who is fitted chiefly for research and for authorship, but the man who is set to give collegiate instruction should be instinct with that quickening force which arouses and intensifies mental life.

The teacher's efficiency is largely determined by his general strength. He commands attention and interest largely according to his intellectual ability, and is always subject to serious drawback, if he seems a "light weight." Though neither his weakness nor his strength may be attributable to his subject, yet the student's estimate of him is likely to affect his estimate of the department.

Besides this general capacity, a certain particular type of mind is wont to be conspicuous in any teacher of marked success; and since intellectual contact with varied mental types is most helpful to intellectual development, it must be considered a misfortune to the student, if he does not come into vital touch with many instructors.

If the teacher is a whole man, he is sure, no matter what his department, to make himself felt in many ways that affect the student's thought, color his sentiments, and determine his ideals. The instructor's views of life and conceptions of manhood are sure to be discerned, and in some departments hardly could a day pass without bringing to an alert teacher many fruitful suggestions. They may arise from investigations in science, or discussions in philosophy, or readings in literature and history. Narrow indeed would be the man who through incapacity, indifference, or a feeling of restriction to his specialty, should exclude those suggestions which may minister so richly to intellectual and moral development.

Colleges not a few have their cherished names of men whose intellectual force and vigorous personality were unspeakably valuable to successive generations of students, with a value somewhat distinct from, and sometimes far transcending the measure of their attainments. Many an alumnus who has not held in memory the formal instruction of such men, acknowledges with a profound sense of obligation the character-shaping and mind-building influence of their manhood and their ability. Personal power should be a condition of higher educational service. Without it knowledge cannot suffice.

When colleges were accustomed to test their own graduates in tutorships preliminary to professor's chairs, there was less danger of disappointment in their personality. Now that Universities with their advanced courses are competing for graduate students, there is risk of attracting to these courses and so to the profession of teaching, some who have a certain capacity for acquisition, but lack personal strength. Such have been sometimes put in college chairs, to the serious loss of students, and to their own discomfort and almost inevitable failure.

If the fit are not easy to find, the fittest at least will survive. The pedagogical succession will not fail. Fortunate is the college in which men of real power are charged with subjects of instruction likely to draw the largest number of students. So long as John Bascom is at Williams College, no undergraduate can afford to omit political economy. Whether or not he cares for the subject, he will elect the man, or will show himself insensible to higher educational values.

A weighty reason why the student should not fail of contact with the strongest minds lies in the tendency of such contact to develop intellectual deference. Authority in the teacher is best ensured when ample knowledge is associated with mental vigor. Sheer intellectuality makes its impress, especially when deductions must be made from knowledge, and principles must be applied in thought and in life. The greater the student's ability, the more desirable is it that wholesome deference for strong men shall save him from any conceit of his own capacity which might hinder receptivity, or prompt him to indulge vagaries of thought which might be fondly deemed original discoveries.

Undue deference to authority is of course to be deprecated. The true teacher will not wish his pupil to esteem anything final because he said it. Nevertheless, a presumption in favor of the *"ipse dixit"* is educationally wholesome. Temporarily and provisionally the fledgling may well take what is given him. Ultimately he must use his wings.

The largest opportunity to impress young men should be that of the college president. But has not this been unhappily abridged through a changed conception of his functions? Instead of being a teacher, coming into vital relation with the Senior class in the study and discussion of weightiest themes, he is for the most part an administrator, the official representative of the college at home and abroad, chiefly engaged in activities which do not give scope to his best powers. The presidents of former decades whose vigorous personality was felt in teaching would have been impatient of such a limitation, and the students of these days may well regret the new conditions. How fortunate was Garfield, to whom the recollection of his college always brought the picture of a long pine table with eager class-mates on its sides, and Mark Hopkins at the end! No wonder that the students of Harvard the other day gave hearty applause, when President Eliot, as a substitute for an absent professor, appeared to take charge of a class for the first time in thirty-five years! *O tempora, O mores!*

Compensation may in part be found in large use of public address and private counsel to guide the thought and inspire the sentiment of the college, and herein it is the privilege of his office to be *"primus inter pares."* His colleagues, however, may contribute no less worthily to an invigorating atmosphere that shall foster goodly growth of mind and manhood. Not every professor can deal as of old with every student. It is to some a change far from welcome, and the regret would be keener, did there not remain, apart from the lecture-room, many natural ways of access and service to young men.

Certainly, what the teacher is in strength of intellect, in vigor and alertness of thought, in breadth of view and of nature, in culture of faculties, refinement of taste, and nobility of manhood, will outweigh and outlast all impartation of knowledge. It is sometimes said of those whom we meet in general society that to

know this or that person is a "liberal education." Who then shall adequately estimate that giving of themselves which was the supreme service of those teachers that live in our hearts?

Changes in studies and in methods have come, and may come again, with needful return perhaps to some things unwisely abandoned, but the product to result from all our processes must be essentially the same—not merely an informed man, an instructed man, a man of technical knowledge ready to be applied in a particular pursuit, but above all a disciplined, formed, cultivated man, having usually some pre-disposition and preliminary equipment for special work, but a man so balanced and in good measure roundly developed, that, if occasion shall arise, he may bring to bear his trained powers with something of that versatility which should mark an educated man.

The American college must not relinquish its essential mission. There was never a generation before whose eyes it was more necessary to exalt conspicuously and persistently the standards of genuine culture. To abandon these would be to forsake intellectual ideals for sordid materialism.

The educational traditions of Colgate University bring no shame to its Alumni. Gratifying enlargement of opportunity has come to the undergraduates of to-day, but the more meagre instruction of earlier decades was not altogether lacking in admirable quality, and some of the men who imparted it, whatever their limitations, for we too had our limitations, were endowed with personal power so real and quickening that lapse of years has not exhausted in us the sense or the worth of it. Some of us here, who were their pupils, then their colleagues, and now are their successors, have cherished an abiding desire to be, I do not say like them, but to be, each after his own type, sources of kindred inspiration to young men, and in our own time not unworthy representatives of liberal education. The effort is sustained not only by its inner reward, but by the assurance that you share our purpose to make the University ever more efficient in promoting sound and symmetrical training.

NEWTON LLOYD ANDREWS.

COLGATE UNIVERSITY,
HAMILTON, N. Y.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
0 019 739 729 9